HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 27 Saturday, July 2, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Democratic Strategy: Is the Democratic leadership going "McCarthyite?" This question is raised by many shrewd folk who watch what goes on in Congress and elsewhere in Government. The answer, of course, is "no." But, at least it may be said that the top-level Democrats want to cater — to a certain extent — to the "McCarthyite" vote. Two signs are noted as evidence of this trend:

(1) Early this week Governor Averell Harriman of New York (who would not exactly disdain the Presidential nomination next year) assailed a Republican-dominated committee in the N.Y. Legislature for failing to probe certain charges. The charges were that at least 30 Communist-influenced summer camps were operating in the Empire State. Some of the Republican leaders in the New York GOP reportedly prefer to conciliate fellow-travellers and "liberals."

(2) At the same time that Democratic and GOP leadership were steam-rollering Senator McCarthy's resolution (to demand discussion of the status of the Russian slave satellite countries, at the Big Four meeting), Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives was putting over a resolution which bore some resemblance to McCarthy's. It was sponsored by House Democratic floor leader John McCormack and was passed by a vote of 367 to 0. While it did not mention the Big Four meeting, it expressed the "sense of the Congress" that the U.S. should try to support "other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence," etc. And it attacked "Soviet imperialism" and "colonialism." It was obviously designed to reach the ears of the numerous groups in this country who are concerned about the fate of Eastern European peoples suffering under the Soviet yoke. These groups were not exactly pleased by the defeat of the McCarthy resolution.

Under The Dome: Those in the know on Capitol Hill say that actually the word "temporary" rise in the debt limit, from $275 billions to $281 billions, is camouflage. Behind it, they say, is the unhappy conviction of key members of Congress that the so-called debt limit is elastic — upwards; and that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey will back a permanent rise next year. The year 1956 is an election year and Humphrey, hitherto firm enemy of lavish expenditures, reportedly has "given up" under the pressure of the "spend and spend" crowd in the Administration.

● In the Office of Defense Mobilization, the word comes that the Administration efforts to obtain stand-by controls of wages and prices since last January have now been abandoned. One reason given is that the President could scarcely talk persuasively of the inevitability of peace and at the same time push for a typical war-time control bill.

● A letter from a correspondent, located in State College, Pa. — site of Penn State College, whose president is Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the President of the U.S. — contains a bit of interesting news:

> **"The local paper announces that Dr. Milton Eisenhower and his daughter, Ruth, are going to Europe to be gone until some time in August." The correspondent suggests that perhaps Dr. Milton is going to attend the Big Four conference scheduled for July 18 in Geneva, Switzerland.**

This intelligence reinforces the belief — widely current in Washington — that the "liberal," internationalist-minded brother of the President "sits in" with the latter on all important decisions, particularly dealing with foreign policy.

● The cream of one big jest among observers on Capitol Hill is the current realization that "one-man hearings" of Congressional committees are as numerous as ever before. It is recalled that about this time last year, there arose a tempest about Senator McCarthy presiding alone over hearings of subversives. The tempest was generated by the "liberals" and now it is these "liberals" who are themselves outstanding in the practice of "one-man hearings." Many of these are held by the sub-committees investigating the anti-trust situation, and they have had before them representatives of such large firms as Kaiser and Chrysler. The daily press — to our knowledge — has so far ignored the one-man nature of these proceedings.

● Much excitement at the press tables on the Hill this week, as Senator Eastland and his Internal Security Subcommittee had before it newspapermen, notably Winston Burdett, who confessed to former membership in the Communist Party and espionage for the Reds. Names of other newsies, allegedly Communist Party members, were given; and more it is said will follow on infiltration of the press. But those named so far are "small fry;" some at the press tables wonder if certain "higher-ups" in

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the news game — long suspected — will be named. Also, the talk is that the American Newspaper Guild has suffered a bad blow from revelations of its role in the "Red era."

Hoover Commission: The "save-$7-billion-a-year" crusade of former President Hoover officially ended this week; but actually the Hoover bombshells will continue to burst for a month or so longer.

For instance, observers here watch eagerly for the book of findings (900,000 words long) of the "task force" on power, headed by Admiral Ben Moreell. It is said to contain recommendations for the Government to get out of the public power business, "lock, stock and barrel." Howls from the "liberals" are anticipated.

The "task forces" are, in effect, sub-committees which report on specific subjects to the Commission itself.

The Commission (not the "task force") official report on power, just published on June 30, follows the Eisenhower Administration line of "partnership," which is — neither "get out" of public power, nor expand it. This is the policy often advocated by Secretary of Interior McKay. What puzzles observers is that two key members of the Ike Administration — Attorney General Brownell and Defense Mobilizer Arthur Flemming — both filed dissents from this week's "moderate" report on power. In short, some people here come to the conclusion that Brownell and Flemming take a position to the Left of the Administration power policy. Does this mean — it is asked — that the White House policy will shift in that direction during the next highly political 12 months?

Lattimore: The Department of Justice has just dropped the prosecution of Professor Owen Lattimore, former Far Eastern expert of the State Department. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952, after voluminous hearings, found that Lattimore was "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Senator Jenner, who was a member of that committee at that time and at present is its ranking Republican member, commented on the dropping of the suit, saying it was unfortunate that the Attorney General's decision meant Lattimore would not have a trial by his peers. "The unanimous conclusion of our committee is a matter of public record," he said. "What is now clear is that we cannot rid our government and our parties of pro-Communist agents by court action alone. We must have the political wisdom to recognize them, even when they have violated no laws, and the political skill to keep them far removed from any influence over national policy."

Observers here recall the way John T. Flynn, in his books *While We Slept* and *The Lattimore Story*, handled the Lattimore matter. Flynn said it was unimportant whether Lattimore was a Communist or not, or whether or not he lied to a Senate committee. "The only point," said Flynn "to be settled is whether or not he supported the aims of the Chinese Communists." On page 103 of *The Lattimore Story*, Flynn said: "The case against Lattimore presented here is not based on just his testimony or on the question of whether he lied or not. It is based on an array of testimony and exhibits from scores of witnesses so clear and definitive that there can be no question in any fair mind that Lattimore and his confederates in the Institute of Pacific Relations and the State Department were responsible for our defeat in China and the victory of Russia."

Wisconsin Story: Will Ike run and, if he does, can he win, in 1956? These questions today are repeated constantly in the Capital, with no great assurance behind the answers. However, the GOP National Committee — it is important to report — is rather unhappily pondering news about the tone of the Wisconsin State GOP convention held on June 25 in Ripon. While most of the nation's press simply reported that the convention asked Ike to run again, the local press in that state did not see it as so simple as all that.

The fact is that the leaders of the convention obviously preferred not to raise the issue of Ike running again at all, and they initially tabled a resolution to request him to file now. But a minority forced the resolution out on the floor and the convention approved, obviously with no great enthusiasm. *The Milwaukee Journal's* headline (June 26) ran, "Eisenhower is Given Hesitant Support."

What did inspire enthusiasm in the Ripon proceedings was an appearance of Senator McCarthy and a resolution passed "censuring" the censure resolution passed against McCarthy last winter by the Federal Senate. The Bricker Amendment was endorsed with fervor. There was apprehension expressed lest Ike's atom pool plan release to the world secrets that should be kept at home. And delegates supported a resolution which called for keeping the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as it stands today, with no additions to incoming quotas or any amendments as proposed by the White House.

Electoral Reform: Two measures to reform the electoral system of naming presidents are now before the Senate. They are: (1) The plan of Senator Daniel (Texas, D.), Resolution SJ31 and (2) the Mundt-Coudert plan, SJ3. Scores of arguments support the idea of revamping the antiquated and distorted system of presidential election. But one point animates many who support one or the other of the proposals: that the old system has given far too much power to the big city states — especially New York — and to the socialistic blocs within those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

states. Thus, the national political conflict has been keyed to conciliate the demands of the most radical element in the states with big electoral votes.

Both the Daniel and Mundt-Coudert proposals would abolish the traditional procedure whereby the "winner takes all" in any state (New York's entire 45 electoral votes go to the winner within that state no matter how slim the margin). The Daniel resolution would abolish the electoral college; the Mundt-Coudert resolution would keep it.

Students of constitutional history prefer the Mundt-Coudert plan for several among many reasons. The Daniel plan, they say, would result in something like Proportional Representation, thereby harming the two-party system. Indeed, P.R. organizations have been boosting this electoral plan for many years. P.R. in Europe has multiplied the number of parties and has often paralyzed (see the example of France) orderly parliamentary procedure. The Communists are adept at exploiting P.R. for their purposes.

Finally, experts point out that the Mundt-Coudert plan is essentially what the electoral college system constituted during the first decade of the Republic: each presidential elector was chosen from a congressional district, with two at-large from each state. Later, party factionalism and greedy politicos — anxious that "the winner take all" — changed it all to the present procedure. What are the chances of some electoral reform this session? Very little, say observers, who fear the two proposals will be lost in the parliamentary shuffle before adjournment.

Minimum Wage: *"A bill to move 100,000 Porto Ricans to New York"* is the Capitol cloakroom title being given to the clause in the minimum-wage bill requiring all Porto Rican industries to raise wages by 25 cents an hour by January 1, 1958. Needlework wages would have to be raised by 217 per cent; clothing, 110 per cent; metals and machinery, 72 per cent.

The 1938 U.S. minimum-wage law applied to Porto Rico; its catastrophic effect upon employment started the great Porto Rican migration to New York. Immediately, the Communist-dominated American Labor Party headed by the late Vito Marcantonio set up offices in Harlem to qualify the new immigrants for relief. Most of the Porto Ricans lived better as relief recipients in New York than they had as workers at home. Their votes kept "party-line" Marcantonio in Congress from 1939 until 1951.

The law was amended in 1940 to allow the U.S. Wage-Hour Administrator to set much lower levels for Porto Rico. The wage-advantage thus obtained began Porto Rico's phenomenal industrial expansion — now threatened by the raises required in the minimum-wage bill that has passed the Senate and is now before the House.

Picketing: A bill to prohibit "recognition" picketing has been introduced in the Illinois Senate.

" 'Recognition' picketing," said Senator W. A. Arrington, its sponsor, "is aimed almost entirely at smaller employers and their employees. A big international union, with power to stop all deliveries into or out from a plant or shop, can knock a small employer out of business within a few days, or force him to sign over his employees to the picketing union."

The small employer is approached by a union organizer and ordered to sign an agreement recognizing the union as bargaining agent for his employees, and to deduct dues from their paychecks. The union organizer rejects an offer to hold an election to determine if the employees want this union to represent them. If the employer does not sign up immediately, pickets are put outside his shop or plant, effectively stopping traffic into or out from his place of business. The employer either signs his employees over to the union or faces the imminent possibility of being put out of business.

The bill would not hinder the activities of unions which in fact represent a majority of the employees in a collective bargaining unit, since it retains all the present bans against labor injunctions where a legitimate labor dispute exists. However, this union election bill would allow an employer or his employees to petition the courts for injunctive relief when picketing is used to force the employer to recognize a union which does not represent his employees.

Larger companies which come under the jurisdiction of the Taft-Hartley Act have some protection against recognition picketing, and their employees have the right to vote by secret ballot for bargaining agents of their own choosing. Smaller employers and their employees have no such defenses. This union election bill will give them a right to demand a secret ballot vote to determine if a union does actually represent a majority of the employees.

Copies of this bill (Senate Bill 592) may be obtained from the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, 20 Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill.

The Federal Aid Myth: Proponents of Federal aid for school construction in the present Congress started out with a pile of statistics from which they drew an alarming picture of the financial inability of many states to provide adequate school buildings on their own resources. At present the figures have been systematically debunked and the champions of Federal aid to education are in statistical distress.

Latest example of this business comes from the office of Congressman Ralph Gwinn (R., N.Y.). Supporters of Federal aid, having become vociferous in the State of Washington, Gwinn sent a telegram to Miss Pearl Wanamaker, Superintendent of Education for the State, asking her whether there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was any school district "which cannot with state aid provide school housing by construction or on a leasing basis."

Miss Wanamaker replied that one school district (Broadway School District in Yakima County) could not with the present program of state aid provide school housing. She said that the bonding limitations of the District were 10% of the assessed value of property and that its property was already assessed at *eighty percent* of its current value.

Thereafter Representative Gwinn received a letter from the Office of the Governor of Washington State advising him that a study of the Legislative Council of the State showed that property in Yakima County was assessed on the average *at 16.5% of its current value.* The Governor's office said that there was no reason to assume that property in the Broadway School District was assessed at any higher rate. It was also pointed out that the Broadway District was only one of 500 school districts, that it had an enrollment of only 700 pupils out of a state-wide total of 500,000, and that even if this District was unable to finance school construction, the resources of the state would be ample to take care of its plight. The plain import of the letter from the Governor's office, however, was that Miss Wanamaker had been careless with her figures.

Protest: The recent annual convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs has touched off what may be an effective rebellion against a small clique which is charged with diluting the organization's Americanism. The first part of the convention was held in the United States as usual. But the latter half was switched to Geneva, Switzerland, after a short recess to give certain delegates time to get to that city — an unprecedented procedure.

Our sources in women's clubs report: (1) In 1947 the internationalists started out to gain control of the Federation. At that time the GFWC had an important department called the "Department of American Citizenship." In that year the President of the organization suddenly changed the name of this department to the "Department of Citizenship" eliminating the word "American." (2) Later, the word "American" was removed from another department called the "Department of the American Home." This was defended on the anti-nationalist ground that "all homes are alike" and the Federation should not be so "provincial" as to concern itself only with American homes. (3) The internationalists have firmly captured the GFWC. Its Executive Board lined up behind the Genocide Pact — the UN proposal denounced by the American Bar Association as destructive of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Several recent Presidents, at least, have been advocates of world government, and the Federation (by resolution) is on record as favoring such a government.

(4) The Federation was actually incorporated by Congress in 1901 for "educational, industrial, philanthropic, literary, artistic and scientific culture and to bring into communication with one another the various women's clubs throughout the world." Today the Federation is largely concerned with militantly promoting political objectives. GFWC officers have interpreted its Congressional charter so as not only to allow foreign women's clubs to hold *membership* in the GFWC but also to permit foreign delegates to vote on convention resolutions pertaining to American policy.

Those who know what has happened to the Federation — and deplore it — emphasize, however, certain encouraging factors in the situation. The rank and file of the Federation, they claim, is in reality solidly pro-American. What has taken place is the old trick of minority control with the result that neither the Federation's annual conventions nor its Executive Committee reflect, in the resolutions used to propagandize Congress, the true political views of the membership. But perhaps the most dangerous development in the Federation is the pronounced tendency of the ruling clique to use the organization to land political jobs for themselves with the Administration in power.

This situation has prompted Mrs. Abbott S. Pond of Wyoming to advocate a resolution providing that upper-bracket officers of the Federation should pledge themselves before taking office not to accept any political appointment for five years after leaving office. Mrs. Pond, one of the ablest members of the Federation, will ask that her resolution be voted on at its next annual convention.

Coming in HUMAN EVENTS . . . a full-length article: "The Truth About Edward R. Murrow," by Victor Lasky.

Letter from L. L. B. Angas, Investment Economist: "Would not miss HUMAN EVENTS for worlds. You do a wonderful job."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 27 HUMAN EVENTS July 2, 1955

Article Section

THE NEW SLAVERY

No "Right-to-Work" Without a Union License

By DONALD R. RICHBERG

FOR A GENERATION all labor unions denounced "yellow dog contracts" under which employees were forced to agree either to join a union approved by their employer or not to join any union. To free labor from such coercion these "yellow dog contracts" were made unlawful by national and state laws.

But today union labor leaders are demanding that a new variety of "yellow dog contract" be legalized. This is called a union shop agreement. Under such an agreement the employer forces every old and new employee to be a member, pay dues and submit to the discipline of one particular union, or else lose his job. The union may be a good or bad union. It may be loyal to the workers and to the government; or a Communist-controlled union disloyal to both.

The old laws prohibiting "yellow dog contracts" have been modified (at union demand) by national laws which permit an employer to make such a contract compelling membership in a union representing a majority of his employees of one craft or class.

The only legal obstacles to the establishment of compulsory unionism and a monopoly of employments throughout the United States are: 1. The laws of eighteen states make it illegal either to compel a man to join a union in order to earn a living, or to prevent him from joining a union. 2. A provision in the Taft-Hartley Act permits these state laws to be enforced; although, where there are no state laws, union closed shop contracts may be lawful. 3. The Constitution of the United States, under which the right of a man to earn a living without being compelled to pay tribute to a private organization, and the right of a man to join or refuse to join a private organization, *should* be and, let us hope, will be protected against private or public denial.

It is hard to understand how labor unions, which have developed as voluntary organizations of self help to free labor from any oppressions of employer power, can justify their present program of using the employer's control of jobs to force men into unions to which they do not wish to belong.

THE MAJOR ARGUMENTS in behalf of compulsory unionism are as follows: 1. "Union security," that is, the strength of the *union,* depends upon universal acceptance of membership as a condition of employment. 2. Majority rule is a democratic principle and a minority of workers who would not voluntarily support the union should be compelled to do so to solidify the power of the majority. 3. The union negotiates contracts for the benefit of all employees of a craft or class and those who do not voluntarily contribute support to an organization which benefits them should be compelled to contribute. 4. The power of discipline over all workers should be available to the union so that it may insure the fulfillment of contracts and other assumed obligations.

Not one of the foregoing arguments can be maintained against the facts, or justify the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oppression and denial of individual liberty which is the inherent wrong of compulsory unionism.

1. It is a simple historical fact that the unions have increased in numbers and in economic and political power in the last twenty years as voluntary organizations and, under favoring national and state laws, they have no need to compel unwilling workers to join and pay them dues.

It is also hardly debatable that a voluntary organization of workers united for self help is inherently a much stronger organization than a union composed to a considerable extent of unwilling members. Many of the strongest friends of organized labor have pointed out on many occasions that the strength of unionism in voluntary organizations would be greatly weakened by converting them into compulsory monopolistic organizations which, if legally permitted, will inevitably require detailed regulation by government which would otherwise be unnecessary.

Two members of the National Defense Mediation Board, Judge Charles E. Wyzanski (former Solicitor of the Department of Labor) and former Senator Frank P. Graham, both made this point in opposition to compulsory unionism. President Franklin D. Roosevelt made a similar public pronouncement. Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the state "right-to-work" cases (335 U.S. 538) quoted extensively from the late Justice Brandeis who held that "the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are non-unionists. . . . Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer."

2. "Majority democratic rule requires the minority to support the majority." This is a wholly fictitious argument because our laws and customs already require the minority of employees who are not members of a labor union to accept the terms and work under the contracts of the majority. This is similar to the requirement that any minority or dissenting group in a community must accept the laws enacted by the majority representatives. But, even in the case of public laws, a dissenting minority, a political party in opposition, is not required to stop its opposition; nor is it required to contribute to the political support of the majority party. Even members of the majority are at liberty to withdraw from such an association.

Those who espouse compulsory unionism are essentially adopting the Communist theory that there should be only one party to which everyone should give allegiance and support. Inside the party there may be disagreements, but no one is permitted to go outside and support an opposition movement.

The claim of democratic majority rule by compulsory unionism is a pure fraud. Our democratic theory of majority rule is based on the preservation of minority rights and minority opposition and the possibility of shifting the majority power. But when the workers are required to join and support a union regardless of their desire to oppose it, the whole democratic basis of majority rule disappears. It is supplanted by a monopoly rule which has no place in a democratic society and which, as a matter of fact, is a product of state Socialism and Communism.

3. The free rider argument: Much public stress is laid on the argument that, since the union negotiates for the benefit of all workers of a class, all such workers should be compelled to contribute to the cost of maintaining the union activities. This argument has a superficial appeal, but it is both fundamentally unsound and highly deceptive as to the facts.

The argument is *fundamentally unsound* because all through our society voluntary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizations carry on activities which benefit a great many who do not contribute any financial or other support. Fraternal organizations, churches, civic and political organizations raise money, organize work and carry it on for the benefit of a large number of persons who contribute no support. How absurd it would be to suggest that whenever a voluntary organization benefits any group of people it should be empowered to compel them by law or by economic pressure to contribute support!

The argument is also *highly deceptive* for three reasons. First, only a part of the dues and assessments of the unions is devoted to negotiating contracts. The unions have a great many activities such as political campaigns, social and economic propaganda, insurance, and so forth, to which no one should be compelled to contribute particularly when he himself is not convinced that they are for his benefit.

Second, the real objective of forcing all workers to join unions is, as the union leaders themselves admit, not so much to compel them to pay their share of an expense, as to compel them to accept the discipline of the organization and, by concerted actions and the appearance of increased numbers, add to the economic and political power of the union. Third, the unions sought and obtained by law a *special* privilege in the right to represent any minority of non-member employees and to make contracts binding on any such minority. The unions took away by law the right and freedom of individual employees to contract for themselves — and now the unions demand that non-members be compelled to pay for having their freedom of contract taken away and exercised against their will!

4. The need of an increased power of discipline: This argument, which is being made with increasing vehemence, is based on the theory that non-union employees, who cannot be disciplined by depriving them of their employment, are a menace both to the union and to the employer because they will not live up to contract obligations. Here again is a fraudulent argument because the non-union employee is just as much bound as the union employee to carry out the obligations of the trade agreements.

Also, without being made a member of the union, the independent worker is subject to employer discipline to an even greater degree than a union member. If he breaks contract obligations, or refuses to obey management orders, he can be and will be disciplined by the employer and he will not have any union backing to support him in a recalcitrant position. On the other hand, if a union man gets in difficulty with the management, the union is obligated to support him if it can. What the unions really mean is that they want the power of discipline over all employees, particularly so that they will all strike, or otherwise support the union officials in whatever position they may take which is antagonistic to management. The fact is that the increased power of discipline given to union officials by compulsory unionism is all contrary to the interest of both the employer and the free worker.

Among other arguments for compulsory unionism, the AFL contends that if the employee is not a union man "he has no voice at all in determining his rate of pay, his hours or other conditions of employment." Theoretically, this appears to be plausible. But as a practical fact the union member of one of the huge unions of modern times has as small a voice in determining union policies and programs as the average citizen who is not active in politics has in making the laws. The most effective voice which any man can have in an organization, unless he is part of the ruling hierarchy, is the voice of opposition, the voice of criticism. This small voice can be made effective only if it is coupled with the power to withdraw from the organization, to refuse to give it moral and financial support and to threaten unwise or vicious leadership

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the development of a rival faction or a rival organization to challenge its authority.

The major value of labor organizations to the workers lies in their power to control their representatives. They may become helpless subjects of a labor autocracy if they are denied the right and freedom of each individual worker to refuse to support an official or an organization which does not truly represent him. How much should a man rely on the servant he employs who then assumes to be his master and says, "You must obey me or I will cut your throat?"

THE UNIONS CLAIM the right-to-work laws are "anti-labor." How can a law sustaining the freedom of labor be honestly called an "anti-labor" law? The unions are actually claiming that it is against the interests of the worker to be free from employer coercion! They are claiming that if the union approves of employer coercion then it is "anti-labor" to insist that the employee be kept free from any tyrannical use of the employer's power, against which union labor claims to be the ancient, time-honored enemy.

The agreement for a union closed shop is now called a "union security" agreement. This very designation is a confession that it is not the *worker* who is made more *secure* by union closed agreements. In fact, he is made utterly dependent upon a tyrannical control of his livelihood exercised jointly by the employer and the union. Only the union itself, that is the union officialdom, is made more "secure" by such agreements. These closed shop contracts, these "one party" monopolies, make it practically impossible for dissenters, even for a substantial majority in the union, successfully to oppose the dictatorial control of a well-entrenched machine of labor bosses.

The Railway Act (1926, 1934), the Wagner Act (1935) and the Taft-Hartley Act (1947) in the same language established in all industries, subject to federal law, the right of all employees to "self-organization" and "to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing" — and the right to exercise these rights free from employer "interference, influence, or coercion." How can there possibly be "self-organization" or "representatives of their own choosing" when men and women are compelled to join unions against their will? How can there be freedom from employer "interference, influence and coercion" when every employee is forced by his employer to join the particular union with which the employer has made a union shop agreement.

Chief Justice Hughes in upholding the constitutionality of the Railway Labor Act (281 U.S. 548) said: "Collective action would be a mockery if representation were made futile by interference with freedom of choice." The outstanding labor unions of the United States are making a mockery out of collective bargaining and destroying the essential freedom of labor by their campaign to establish compulsory unionism which should not be lawful under a free government or tolerated by a free people.

DONALD R. RICHBERG, one-time General Counsel and later head of the NRA and Director of the National Emergency Council, is well-known for his writings on political and economic subjects. HUMAN EVENTS has published two of Mr. Richberg's pieces: "The Question of the Hour," January 25, 1950; and "How Communism Is Winning," August 29, 1951.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED